

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6156
APPLICANT NAME: Kings River Conservation District
PROJECT TITLE: Kings Basin Regional Implementation Plan

FUNDS REQUESTED: \$49,571,784
COST MATCH: \$13,004,282
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$62,576,066

DESCRIPTION: FID Banking Facilities is a GW recharge and recovery project, which provides water to urban, agriculture and benefits river fishery. Water stored will be delivered to growers and entities that purchase water. RCWD Terranova Facilities Project will develop a delivery system to convey surface water to agriculture and assist in the correction of the GW overdraft. Clovis Recycled Water Distribution Facility Project will construct a distribution system for the City's planned 8.4MGD Sewage Treatment Water Recycling Facility. The plan adds a network of pipelines and pumps will deliver the treated water for irrigation demands. Dinuba Reclamation Conservation Recreation Project will redistribute GW that is currently concentrated under the City's Waste Treatment Facilities to agricultural and excess water to the Alta for use. The uses of the water on grass crops will reduce nitrate levels in GW.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The applicant states that they will develop an IRWMP and it is scheduled to be adopted by January 1, 2007. Attachment 3 is a work plan which will provide a "road map" for completion of an IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The applicant provides an excellent narrative description and maps of the region. This criterion is fully addressed and documented. All internal boundaries are shown; major surface water infrastructure is described; as is water quantity, quality, jurisdiction, and delivery issues. The applicant fully describes and justifies the IRWMP region's physical, as well as political boundaries within the region that influence water use. The application provides documentation showing how the Upper Kings River Water Forum (Water Forum) assists in the regional planning process.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The applicant describes the objectives fully, details possible future and known conflicts, and describes how the IRWMP will address them. The applicant provides good documentation regarding regional planning objectives with their 2001 MOU. However, the organization of this information could be improved. The page numbers listed in Attachment 5 do not match the information found in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The work plan describes how alternatives will undergo detailed engineering, economic, and environmental analysis to determine which water management strategies to use. The work plan describes in detail how the strategies work together to provide reliable water supply and improved water quality. The applicant could improve the organization of this information. There is a brief discussion of opportunities that exist to increase water supply reliability through recharge ponds and the relation of this to environmental improvements and ecosystem restoration, but the tie to ecosystem restoration could be strengthened. The Dinuba and Fresno Irrigation District Briggs/Washington Banking projects claim to create seasonal wetlands and improve the Kings River fishery; however there is no data to support this claim.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The schedule was developed in consultation with the Water Forum and stakeholders in public meetings and appears to be reasonable. The applicant could improve by better organizing the information, reviewers had difficulties in finding supporting information, and by providing more narrative detail to go along with the graphics provided for the schedules of all 4 projects. Since the IRWMP has not been adopted, it is unknown whether the participating entities have agreed on the regional priorities.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The planning phase is not complete and several ongoing technical studies will be utilized in the development of the IRWMP are still in progress. The implementation phase seems a bit cloudy. The page numbers listed in Attachment 5 do not match the information found in Attachment 3. The work plan discusses the regional problems, issues, and conflicts and how the IRWMP will address them. The specific timeline for the development of actions or studies is not clear. Without a completed IRWMP, it is unclear how projects of the proposed IRWMP will be implemented. The applicant proposes an institutional structure to ensure implementation of the IRWMP, which is briefly described. A more detailed description needs to be provided to clarify how implementation will be done.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Potential impacts and benefits are generally discussed in the work plan and will be determined when the IRWMP is completed. There was no discussion of potential negative impacts of not implementing the projects. There was no discussion of the advantages of a regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts and no discussion of potential impacts to DACs. The applicant could improve their proposal by discussing the overlapping benefits of implementing all four projects.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant proposes to monitor IRWMP performance using monthly progress and status reports. The applicant is still in the planning process, so exact details have not been included in the proposal. There was a general discussion of assessing the performance of the proposed IRWMP. There was no discussion of measures to gather performance data.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant proposes to utilize existing data from Water Forum member agencies and collect new data in a form that supports SWAMP and GAMA. The applicant includes information about how the data will be disseminated to the public and stakeholders such as brochures, fliers, fact sheets, etc. However, the applicant discusses how a data management plan will be developed when their IRWMP is completed. The details of a data management plan are lacking.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

There is limit information about the financial side of the IRWMP. The applicant proposes to use the financing and economics workgroup of the Water Forum to evaluate alternatives. The deliverable for Task 12 of the proposal is a technical memorandum which describes the analysis of financial and revenue analysis, distribution of benefits to support cost allocation and evaluation of alternatives, but this is currently not part of the IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant explains that an inventory of existing local plans was completed. The applicant states that the IRWMP will be used to support updates to general plans. However, the applicant is not specific about how that will be done. Without a completed IRWMP, it is unclear whether the applicant can demonstrate coordination with local planning and management efforts. The information in this section was difficult to find and could be better organized and supported with documentation.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The applicant describes their process of stakeholder involvement. In order to target stakeholders not already involved in the Water Forum workgroups, a public affairs plan has been prepared by the applicant to address outreach efforts and engage stakeholders. Public outreach for individual groups is targeted. However, without a completed IRWMP, the applicant cannot demonstrate stakeholder involvement through a collaborative regional process.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

Attachment 6 provides good descriptions of each of the 4 projects that are part of the overall implementation proposals. Within each proposal, there appears to be a clear scientific basis. However, the scientific basis could be better documented. In addition, water quality benefits could be better demonstrated by detailing specific pollutants. The proposal could improve by describing how implementation of the 4 projects as a group achieves regional benefits.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

2

There are 4 projects in the proposal and it does not appear that the projects have been prioritized, but it appears that all 4 projects are considered "high priority." There is no indication that the projects are prioritized within the region or within the proposal itself. There is no priority relationship to an IRWMP.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Cost estimates were included for each proposed project and most appear to be reasonable. However, there are two City of Clovis cost estimates and the one is unclear for Raisin City. Construction contingency is different for each project, and the Dinuba project has a 16% contingency. The applicant proposes to prepare cost estimates for the life cycle of the project (50 yrs) including capital, replacement, and O&M costs (Subtask 8.1). It is unclear whether the applicant intends to use State funds towards land purchase for the City of Dinuba's golf course.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The schedule is detailed and complete for each of the 4 projects, including tasks proposed to be funded from this program and those to be funded from other sources. The schedules seem reasonable for implementation within the timeframe, but the Proposal could be improved by providing a narrative description of how the schedules for the individual projects have been coordinated to achieve multiple benefits.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The applicant explains that in dry years, insufficient surface water supply leads to increased groundwater pumping to meet water demands. The applicant could improve by explaining the need for these projects to be implemented as a group. The critical negative impact that would result if the proposal is not funded is not described in Attachment 9, but was included in Attachment 11 which caused some confusion. Only economic and financial impacts were discussed. The proposal could benefit from a discussion of environmental or other impacts.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

0

Attachment 10 was not submitted.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposed projects focus on groundwater overdraft and water supply reliability, except for the City of Dinuba project, which addresses water quality concerns, nitrates. The applicant lists the benefits the projects will achieve; however, most of these benefits are at the local level.

TOTAL SCORE: 61
